

Independent Evaluation – Management Response

(Note: This form is to be included in the final report.)

Name of programme/office/unit:	UNOSAT		
Name of programme manager	Einar Bjorgo		
Name of project undertaking	Strengthening capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa	ID	C2021.TARSA076.NORAD
Name of evaluation	Independent Baseline Evaluation of the “Strengthening capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa” project		
Report issuance:	October 2022		

SECTION I – Comments on Findings/ Conclusions

Management agrees with the evaluator’s findings and considers the baseline context similar to our own assessments in the inception reports. Overall, we are happy to see that the evaluation finds the project to fit well within the strategies of our partner countries. We understand that carrying out this exercise was difficult as it involves eight countries with different needs and deliverables, but it has captured the baseline situation well and provided us with a useful Scorecard methodology with which to measure and collect data on the results of the projects.

We kindly thank the evaluator for his time and for providing us with a useful baseline by which to assess project progress.

--

SECTION II - RECOMMENDATIONS					
Recommendation		Management Response and Planned Action			
		Accepted Partially Accepted Rejected	Planned action	Budget allocated (if necessary)	Status (planned, under implementation, implemented)
1.	Project's log-frame outputs could be specified beyond "capacities developed" to match the specific national demand for geospatial products. The specific outputs e.g., "applications to evaluate climate risk in land parcels" or "satellite-based oil spill monitoring application" are needs identified by the national beneficiaries (government organizations) to minimize public sector costs and maximize social benefits from a potential market-driven upscale of the project's outcomes.	Partially accepted	New impact indicators already added (no change at output level)	n/a Implemented	
		<p>Comments:</p> <p>We partially accept this recommendation, only to ensure the logframe is not overly complicated. However we agree that the logframe should match specific national demands. As we have indicators on disaster and climate resilience, we have added an indicator on land management.</p> <p>To keep things simple, the logframe will continue to specify the target of output level indicators as number of technical backstopping or number of number of geospatial solutions, with outcome level indicators seeking to know how knowledge and tools are used.</p> <p>Additional qualitative indicators (i.2 – i.4) have been added at the impact level to assess the results of enhanced capacities and access to geospatial products. These new indicators are more specific to see how they have addressed stakeholder needs and how they have improved decision-making.</p>			
Recommendation		Accepted Partially accepted Rejected	Planned action	Budget allocated (if necessary)	Status (planned, under implementation, implemented)
2.	The project could strive to be gender responsive by promoting disaggregated data collection and	Partially accepted	We will consider adding an outcome level indicator on number of focal ministries	n/a	Planned

Management Response Template – Independent Evaluations

<p>dissemination. The project could realize advocacy and awareness during the inception phase and training and courses. Additionally, a module on gender and GIT and climate finance could be incorporated into the training schedule, building upon the case studies developed during the implementation of prior UNOSAT projects. To account for the project's gender objectives, the following indicators are proposed:</p> <p>Output-level</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of women/ other groups made vulnerable participating in training; 2. Number of women/ other groups made vulnerable participating in technical teams; 3. Number of organizations collect disaggregated data; 4. Climate funding proposals address differential exposure, vulnerability, and impacts of hydrometeorological hazards on men, women, and vulnerable groups. <p>Outcome level</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of women/other groups made vulnerable successfully completing the training 2. Number of project's focal agencies that collect disaggregated data based on 		collecting gender disaggregated data		
<p>Comments:</p> <p>We agree that having a module on gender and GIT would be beneficial to include as part of the technical trainings. It would be best to administer it after the advanced technical training course.</p> <p>Regarding the suggested output indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We already collect the first indicator through 1.1.3 (number of participants per training), which has a target asking for gender ratio. - The project is probably unable to affect the number of women working within the focal ministries, so we think it would be best not to include this suggestion - The third indicator could provide interesting results, so this will indeed be adopted and incorporated into the appropriate section in the logframe. It may be an add on to an impact or outcome level indicator rather than at the output level. It can also be supported by data collected from indicator 4.b "Increase in knowledge on how to collect and apply gender disaggregated data" - This fourth indicator has already been adopted into 4.c "Improved knowledge on how to include gender and human rights considerations in climate funding proposals" after fruitful discussions about the logframe with the evaluator. Many thanks. <p>Outcome level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is represented in indicator 4.a "All Female participants achieve equal or more than their male counterparts in regard to the learning objectives to ensure no one is left behind" - This suggestion is similar to point 3 in the above output level suggestions. It can be adopted and similarly be extrapolated from indicator 4.b <p>Impact level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although the project cannot directly influence whether or not focal ministries collect gender disaggregated data, we can consider adding this at the impact level. Nevertheless it is similarly somewhat reflected in indicator 4.b. 				

Management Response Template – Independent Evaluations

	<p>gender and other vulnerable groups</p> <p>Impact level</p> <p>1. Disaggregated data are incorporated into decision-making processes. E.g. climate funding proposals address differential exposure, vulnerability, and impacts of hydrometeorological hazards on men, women, and vulnerable groups</p>				
Recommendation		Accepted Partially accepted Rejected	Planned action	Budget allocated (if necessary)	Status (planned, under implementation, implemented)
3.	<p>The logical framework must respond to realistic assumptions and logical connections between activities, outputs, and outcomes. Therefore, the results framework should:</p> <p>a. Not include indicators of impacts not attributable to the project, such as disaster loss and damage changes, and only suggest contributions to these areas.</p> <p>b. Include specific outputs related to the needs of the eight government organizations involved.</p> <p>c. Reformulate the outcomes according to the intended use of the project's outputs (organizational change).</p>	Accepted	Changes to the logframe will be made	n/a	Planned
		<p>Comments:</p> <p>We agree with this recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A. We have removed SDGs from the impact level and created a new section on “alignment”. - B. This is reflected in the inception reports in Table 12: “Issues & Priority Needs” (which provides an in-depth narrative on the exact planned products) and Table 13: “Priority Needs and Project Outputs” (which lists deliverables as outputs). These are in line with the indicators 2.1.1 and 2.2.1 in logframe. The details in the inception report can be consolidated within the logframe. - C. The results chain will be duly reviewed again and reformulated to ensure a logical flow. 			

Management Response Template – Independent Evaluations

Name of Director/Programme Manager	Date	Signature
Einar Bjørge	15/11/2022	